



# State Equity Data Chart

2020- 2021

## 2021

Measure	Group 1 High Minority	Group 2 Highest FRPL	Group 3 Title Schools	Group 4 Most Rural	Group 5 Non-Title Schools	Group 6 Lowest FRPL
% FRPL	89.7%	100.0%	63.1%	55.1%	34.7%	7.7%
% of Minority Students	85.7%	54.9%	28.8%	3.6%	13.6%	10.6%
% of Minority Teachers	33.3%	20.5%	9.5%	0.8%	3.4%	3.5%
Discipline Incident Rate	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.6%	0.1%
• Elementary	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
• Middle/Junior	0.5%	0.8%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%	0.3%
• High School	0.2%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%	1.0%	0.4%
Average Years of Experience	11.0	11.4	12.0	12.4	13.0	13.9
Average Teacher Salary	\$53,534	\$47,947	\$46,842	\$39,749	\$51,176	\$58,253
• Average 1st Year Bacc Teacher Salary	\$38,814	\$36,783	\$36,275	\$32,175	\$37,754	\$40,433
• Average 1st Year Mast Teacher Salary	\$47,154	\$45,673	\$44,704	\$36,675	\$44,532	\$47,228
• Average Teacher Salary 0-5 Years of Experience	\$44,068	\$40,437	\$39,016	\$34,385	\$41,253	\$44,691
• Average Teacher Salary 6-10 Years of Experience	\$49,673	\$45,066	\$43,605	\$37,673	\$46,285	\$50,578
• Average Teacher Salary 11+ Years of Experience	\$61,213	\$53,817	\$51,819	\$43,151	\$55,638	\$63,154
Retention Rate 1 Year (2020-2021)	73.8%	77.0%	79.4%	83.5%	81.7%	80.6%
Retention Rate 3 Year (2018-2021)	42.0%	47.3%	54.2%	58.9%	57.7%	57.4%
% First Year Teachers	9.5%	8.5%	6.4%	5.3%	4.6%	3.7%
% Teachers with Less Than 3 Years of Experience	18.4%	16.9%	13.0%	11.3%	9.7%	7.7%
% First Year Principals	12.4%	8.1%	10.7%	9.6%	8.8%	9.5%
% First Year Teachers Assigned a Mentor	84.2%	87.2%	92.1%	96.5%	95.9%	94.0%
Avg. overall preparation 1st year Teacher response (%) Good/Very Good	76.2%	75.1%	81.7%	78.7%	82.5%	87.5%
Avg. overall preparation 1st year Principal response (%) Good/Very Good	88.1%	96.0%	88.0%	83.3%	89.0%	100.0%
% Teachers Less than Fully Qualified	15.1%	15.5%	11.0%	20.0%	11.8%	4.1%
• Elementary	11.2%	11.9%	8.6%	12.8%	3.9%	3.1%
• Middle/Junior	18.5%	17.7%	16.4%	15.2%	9.1%	4.1%
• High School	24.6%	24.8%	30.0%	30.2%	19.4%	8.8%
% Teaching Out-of-Field	13.7%	14.2%	9.9%	18.6%	10.8%	3.8%
• Elementary	9.9%	10.6%	7.6%	11.6%	3.3%	2.7%
• Middle/Junior	16.6%	16.3%	15.0%	13.8%	8.1%	3.8%
• High School	23.1%	23.2%	28.2%	28.5%	18.1%	8.3%
Avg. Effectiveness Indicator %	74.3%	75.6%	76.4%	76.6%	77.2%	79.7%

- **Group 1**—Highest Minority schools (317 schools). Non-White students and Hispanics of any race
- **Group 2**—Highest FRPL of schools (317 schools). Students eligible for Free and Reduced lunch
- **Group 3**—Title I Schools (1234 schools: Targeted(109) or Schoolwide(1125))
- **Group 4**—Most Rural Schools (357 schools). NCES Urbanicity Classification “Rural: Remote”
- **Group 5**—Non-Title Schools (1019 Schools)
- **Group 6**—Lowest FRPL of schools (317 schools). Students eligible for Free and Reduced lunch

## 2021

The data and related discussion to follow draw upon the most recent data available. In most cases, the data correspond to the 2020-21 school year. The “Definitions” section below indicates specific exceptions to this rule where applicable, as well as cases in which multiple years were combined.

All Missouri public elementary and secondary schools are included in the analysis, except as follows:

- Area vocational/technical schools and alternative schools are excluded since data are reported at students’ regular schools in their home districts.
- Correctional facilities and medical treatment centers are excluded.
- Division of Youth Services sites is excluded.

To assist with interpreting the data contained in the chart, the following definitions and information are offered for each of the measures in the table:

**\*Poor student:** A student eligible for a free or reduced priced lunch (FRPL). The 317 schools with the highest rates of FRPL students (100 percent) are referred to as “high-poverty” schools. These are compared with the 317 schools with the lowest rates of FRPL students, referred to as “low-poverty” schools. Data submitted by districts through Screen 15 of October Cycle of the MOSIS/Core Data system.

**\*Rural: Remote:** Census-defined rural territory that is more than 25 miles from an urbanized area and also 10 miles from an urban cluster. The “rural: remote” designations used in this plan were extracted from the National Center for Education Statistics’ Elementary/Secondary Information System (ELSI) and correspond to the 2020-21 school year (most recent available data). Schools that meet these criteria are referred to as “rural schools”.

**\*Minority:** Non-white students, including Hispanic of any race. 317 schools with the highest average of minority students are referred to as “high-minority” schools. Data submitted by districts through Screen 16 of October Cycle of the MOSIS/Core Data system.

**\*Discipline rate:** The number of incidents divided by the number of students (incident is when a student is removed from the regular classroom half (1/2) a day or more). Data submitted by districts through Screen 09 of June Cycle of the MOSIS/Core Data system.

**\*Retention rate:** Percent of teachers retained from 2020 to 2021 (one-year retention rate), or from 2018 to 2021 (three-year retention rate). A teacher is considered to be retained if, in 2021, he or she remained employed as a teacher in the same school where he or she was employed in either 2020 (for the one-year analysis) or 2018 (for the three-year analysis). Data submitted by districts through Screen 18 of the October Cycle of the MOSIS/Core Data system.

**\*Inexperienced teacher:** A first- year teacher. Data submitted by districts through Screen 18 of the October Cycle of the MOSIS/Core Data system.

**\*Less than fully qualified (for the statutory term “unqualified”)** – A teacher who meets one or more of the following criteria:

## 2021

- Is teaching on a provisional certificate
- Is teaching on a temporary authorization certificate
- Is lacking the necessary credential to be considered appropriately certified for at least one teaching assignment

Data is combined from Certification and data submitted by districts through Screen 20 of the October Cycle of the MOSIS/Core Data system.

**\*Out-of-field:** A teacher who is considered inappropriately certified by virtue of teaching a subject that does not correspond to one or more of the teacher's active certifications. Data is combined from Certification and data submitted by districts through Screen 20 of the October Cycle of the MOSIS/Core Data system.

**\*Effective Index:** An average overall rating of the general collective effectiveness of the teachers in a school. Since Missouri does not mandate a single evaluation model for all LEAs, an index was developed to summarize aggregate teacher effectiveness ratings for each school in the most consistent manner possible. On Screen 18a of Core Data, an annual data collection by the Department that occurs at the end of the school year, LEAs submit the number of teachers evaluated that year within each of the summative performance levels used in the local evaluation system. The data are reported in order of increasing effectiveness. The number of teachers in each level is assigned a point value equal to the rank position of the level. The total point value of the teachers' collective ratings is then divided by the maximum points possible based on the parameters of the local system. For example, in a five-level system in which 10 teachers were evaluated, the maximum point value possible would be 50 ( $10 \times 5 = 50$ ). If each teacher were rated at the second highest effectiveness level, that collective effectiveness would be worth 40 points ( $10 \times 4 = 40$ ). In this situation, the index would be calculated at .80 ( $40/50 = .80$ ).

According to a number of measures contained in the table, these data suggest that the learning experience of students in high-poverty, high-minority and rural schools compared to students in low-poverty schools is quite different. High-poverty, high-minority and rural students appear to learn from less-experienced, unqualified, out-of-field, or less-effective teachers at higher rates than occur in low-poverty schools.